United Nations A/C.1/52/PV.24

General Assembly
Fifty-second session

Official Records

First Committee
24th Meeting
Monday, 17 November 1997, 3 p.m.
New York

Chairman: Mr. Nkgowe . . . . . (Botswana)

The meeting was called to order at 3.35 p.m.

Agenda items 62 to 83 (*continued*)

Action on all draft resolutions submitted under all items

The Chairman: In accordance with the adopted programme of work and timetable, this afternoon the Committee will continue its action on all draft resolutions submitted under all agenda items.

As I informed members of the Committee at our meeting on Friday, the Committee will proceed to take a decision on draft resolutions A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1, L.28/Rev.1, L.48 and L.51/Rev.1, in that order.

Before giving the floor to delegations wishing to comment on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1, I will give the floor to the Director of the Centre for Disarmament Affairs to make a comment on document A/52/309/Add.1.

Mr. Davinic (Director, Centre for Disarmament Affairs): Mr. Chairman, as you said, I would like to draw the Committee's attention to a document that has just been released under the symbol A/52/309/Add.1, which is the report of the Secretary-General on the work of Regional Centres. The origin of this report — in other words, the reasons why the Secretary-General submitted this report — are explained in paragraphs 6 and 7.

Let me briefly recount these reasons. In his proposed programme budget for the biennium 1998-1999, the Secretary-General recommended certain cuts in the posts of the Centre for Disarmament Affairs. In fact, he proposed that the posts of the Directors of the three Regional Centres should be abolished. In considering this proposal, the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions held discussions which resulted in its report to the Fifth Committee which, *inter alia*, states,

> "that the proposal of the Secretary-General to abolish the centres should be drawn to the attention of the First Committee and that before the General Assembly takes a decision on the matter, the Secretary-General should provide additional information on the status of voluntary contributions and, as concerns Lomé, the status of discussions with UNDP." [A/52/7 (Chap. II, Part II), para. II.12]

This is a rather important issue, and the Secretary-General, in compliance with this request, has prepared this report detailing the status of voluntary contributions to the three Regional Centres and also explaining the status of his discussions with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in order possibly to provide financial resources for the work of the Regional Centre in Lomé.

It is quite obvious that the Committee will not be able to hold substantive discussions on this report, because this is the last day of its work. Nevertheless, I would appeal to the members of the First Committee to apprise themselves of the content of this report. And since the work of the Fifth Committee on this issue is not yet over, they might wish to give appropriate instructions to their representatives in that Committee to take appropriate positions on this proposal.

97-86545 (E)

This record contains the original texts of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, Room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

I should like, however, to emphasize once again that the Secretary-General is not proposing that the three Regional Centres be abolished. He is proposing that the three posts of Director of these Regional Centres be abolished for the time being due to a lack of financial resources from extra-budgetary sources, which are the primary source of their funding. The report contains a graphic presentation of the state of voluntary contributions and also explains, as I have already pointed out, where we stand in our discussions with UNDP aimed at securing a possible financial contribution for the work of the Centre in Lomé.

The Chairman: Before the Committee proceeds to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1, I shall call on those delegations wishing to introduce revised draft resolutions.

Mr. Abdel Aziz (Egypt): I have the pleasure to speak today on behalf of the delegations of Costa Rica, Niger, Nigeria, Saudi Arabia and Egypt in submitting the revised draft resolution on agenda item 71(c), entitled "Transparency in armaments", as contained in document A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1, dated 14 November 1997.

The revised draft resolution is a clear expression by the sponsors of their firm belief in the interrelationship between transparency in conventional weapons on the one hand and transparency in weapons of mass destruction and transfers of equipment and technologies directly related to the development and manufacturing of such weapons on the other hand. The draft also stresses the need to address the question of transparency in armaments in a balanced manner that takes into account this interrelationship.

I am sure that all my colleagues here still remember that our agreement to establish the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms in the aftermath of the Gulf war was reached on the understanding that extensive efforts would be made to have weapons of mass destruction included in an expanded scope of the Register. This understanding is clearly reflected in General Assembly resolution 46/36 L and in subsequent resolutions of the General Assembly on this item.

Despite repeated reaffirmations every year and despite extensive discussions of this subject in the panels of experts established by the Secretary-General in 1994 and 1997, respectively, no improvement has been achieved in this regard. For that reason, the sponsors felt it imperative to supplement the annual resolution adopted on this subject with another draft resolution stressing the relationship between these two aspects and requesting the Secretary-General to seek the views of Member States on ways and means of enhancing transparency in the fields of weapons of mass destruction and transfers of equipment and technologies directly related to the development and manufacturing of such weapons, with a view to addressing the concerns of Member States not participating in the Register and thus also enhancing transparency in the field of conventional weapons.

It is no secret that States that are against transparency in the field of weapons of mass destruction or against the linkage between transparency in such weapons and transparency in conventional weapons are the same States that do not depend only on the Register in addressing their security concerns, but depend first and foremost on military alliances and agreements that provide them with advantages over a large number of Members of the United Nations. These advantages are clear, mutual and non-discriminatory commitments that lead eventually to security.

The sponsors of the draft resolution had hoped that their point of view would be incorporated in draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.43, but despite the negotiations conducted in a positive atmosphere with the sponsors of that resolution, they insisted on putting that draft to the vote on Friday. Therefore, we find it necessary to present our draft today, with slight modifications. The modifications introduced in the revised version are aimed at limiting the scope of the draft resolution to weapons of mass destruction and to transfers of equipment and technologies directly related only to the development and manufacture of such weapons.

This change should not in any way be interpreted as a change in our position calling for transparency in all transfers of high technology with military applications. It should be looked at as limiting the scope of this draft resolution only to transparency in all issues related to weapons of mass destruction on the understanding that transparency in transfers of other high technologies with military applications shall be dealt with in other resolutions.

With this introduction, I recommend that all Member States that support the principle of transparency in armaments without selectivity vote in favour of the draft resolution.

The Chairman: I now give the floor to those delegations wishing to make general statements.

Mr. Than (Myanmar): My delegation would like briefly to comment on the report of the Secretary-General contained in document A/52/309/Add.1, and we would also like to refer to the comments just made by the Director of the Centre for Disarmament.

I should like to draw the Committee's attention to the fact that last Friday, we adopted draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.3 on the work of the Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific. We would like to stress here that the Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific is run entirely on the basis of voluntary contributions and that the Member States of the region are highly appreciative of the activities and the work of the Centre. So, since it is run entirely on voluntary contributions, we would like to see the continuation of the work of the Regional Centre.

From the comment made by the Director of the Centre for Disarmament, we understand that the Secretary-General is considering abolishing the post of Director. As we would like to see the continuation of the work of the Regional Centre, we believe that the post of Director should be retained.

Although we understand the measures for financial stringency, we believe that we should also take into account the performance of the Regional Centre. So it is the wish of my delegation that we should retain the post of Director for the Regional Centre in Asia and the Pacific.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): I would like to take this opportunity to make some comments on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/52/L.28/Rev.1, which is sponsored by Japan and other delegations.

It is natural to expect Japan to take the initiative for nuclear disarmament, since the Japanese people were the victims of the only two instances when nuclear weapons have actually been used, resulting in millions of casualties in Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

The objective of nuclear disarmament has also been accorded the highest priority by the world community, including at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, and reaffirmed by the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice, by the Canberra Commission and by the Non-Aligned Movement.

It is unfortunate that in order to elicit support for this initiative from the nuclear-weapon States, the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/52/L.28/Rev.1 has been formulated in a way that is unlikely to advance its principal objective. Instead of addressing nuclear disarmament, the draft resolution focuses on nuclear non-proliferation. This is equated with nuclear disarmament in the last preambular paragraph.

The very first operative paragraph of the draft resolution urges universal ratification of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), while the call for reduction of nuclear weapons is relegated to operative paragraph 2. This is inexplicable. The non-proliferation cart cannot be put before the nuclear-disarmament horse. By doing so the draft resolution appears to endorse the unacceptable excuse advanced by some nuclear Powers — that is, that they cannot agree to nuclear disarmament because of the danger of nuclear proliferation.

Moreover, the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/52/L.28/Rev.1 — while repeatedly welcoming various steps taken towards nuclear-arms reductions by the major nuclear Powers and progress on non-proliferation issues, such as the indefinite extension of the NPT and the adoption of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty — studiously omits even taking note of the several negative developments of which we are all aware, such as the assertion by some nuclear-weapon States that they will continue to retain nuclear weapons indefinitely; the continued testing of nuclear weapons under the cover of programmes ostensibly meant to keep such weapons reliable; the development of new nuclear weapons designed for actual use in war; the approval of war-fighting doctrines envisaging the use of such weapons against nuclear-weapon and non-nuclear-weapon States; the threats held out of the possible use of nuclear weapons, including against non-nuclear-weapon States in case of the use or the threat of use of other weapons of mass destruction; and the extension of the doctrine of nuclear deterrence to expanded and renewed military alliances.

It is notable that the draft resolution does not renounce the doctrine of nuclear deterrence and nuclear threat espoused by some nuclear-weapon States and military alliances.

Under the circumstances, it is not surprising that the nuclear-weapon States which have I have mentioned do not have any difficulty in supporting the draft resolution in document A/C.1/52/L.28/Rev.1. Indeed, they may see it as an alibi for resisting the call for multilateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament in the Conference on Disarmament

and for rejecting proposals for a programme for the eventual elimination of nuclear weapons, with our without a time-bound framework.

It was for these reasons that Pakistan was compelled this year to propose the amendments contained in document A/C.1/52/L.48. Over the course of the past week we have had extensive consultations on these amendments and on the draft resolution in document A/C.1/52/L.28/Rev.1 with the Japanese and other delegations. I wish to thank all those delegations, including one nuclear-weapon State, which were prepared to support these amendments. However, in response to an appeal made by Japan, my Government has decided not to press the amendments in A/C.1/52/L.48 to a vote. Yet, for the reasons I have explained, the delegation of Pakistan will abstain in the voting on the draft resolution; and if operative paragraph 1 is voted on separately we shall be obliged to vote against it, since it does not belong in this draft resolution.

Mr. Hayashi (Japan): Since the delegation of Pakistan submitted the proposed amendments, contained in document A/C.1/52/L.48, to the draft resolution sponsored by Japan and others, contained in document A/C.1/52/L.28/Rev.1, the delegations of Pakistan and Japan have been engaged in extensive consultations in order to find a solution to this matter.

In the consultations, which lasted more than a week, my delegation stressed the great importance that my country attached to this draft resolution aimed at the elimination of nuclear weapons — corresponding to the first such draft resolution adopted in the First Committee and in the General Assembly, in 1994, and to the others adopted in the following two years. The Pakistani delegation explained its views on the draft resolution in detail.

I am certain that our candid exchange of views was extremely useful for both our countries, and today I have the pleasure of informing the First Committee that, as the representative of Pakistan stated just now, we have reached a mutual understanding.

I take this opportunity to express my deep appreciation to the delegation of Pakistan, and especially to Mr. Munir Akram for his constructive attitude in conducting the consultations and for his spirit of cooperation and understanding in making the decision not to pursue the proposed amendment.

Now we are ready to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.28/Rev.1, and my delegation sincerely hopes that it will be adopted with as many positive votes as possible.

Mr. Afeto (Togo) (*interpretation from French*): I wish to comment on the report of the Secretary-General contained in document A/52/309/Add.1, on the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa, the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific and the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean. As members know, no item on the regional centre in Africa appears on the agenda of the First Committee at this session: the Secretary-General has been requested to submit a report on this item to the General Assembly at its fifty-third session. Hence, we were rather surprised to be presented with this report, especially at this very late stage in our work.

When he introduced the report this afternoon, the Director of the Centre for Disarmament Affairs spoke of the abolition of the posts of Centre Directors. But paragraph 11 of the report states with reference to the Lomé Centre that in the absence of funding the operations of the Centre might have to be suspended as of 1 January 1998. Is it the post of Director or the very operations of the Centre that are in question here? This is unclear.

We must be told clearly whether this item appears on the agenda of the Fifth Committee; it is certainly not on the agenda of the First Committee this year.

Mr. Thapa (Nepal): I too wish to comment on the report contained in document A/52/309/Add.1, which was introduced by the Director of the Centre for Disarmament Affairs this afternoon. As the representative of Myanmar has said, we unanimously adopted last Friday draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.3, on the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific. Moreover, many representatives spoke highly of the performance of the centres, as does the report of the Secretary-General. I too fail to understand why the Director has introduced this report at this late date.

Echoing the remarks of the representative of Myanmar, I should like to request that the activities of the Kathmandu Centre continue and that the post of Director not be abolished.

Mr. Miranda (Peru) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Like other speakers, I wish to comment on the statement made earlier by the Director of the Centre for Disarmament

Affairs. We are struck by the fact that this proposal was sent to the Fifth Committee without being simultaneously put before the First Committee, even though there was sufficient time to do this, and that, after the Fifth Committee had discussed the matter, the report in question was dated only last Friday: the penultimate day of our work — should the Committee complete its work today.

I do not want to address the reasons why the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean, with its headquarters at Lima, is unable to continue its activities; although it had resources for several years, it had no Director appointed by the Secretary-General during that time. Yet I would like to say that, as the report of the Secretary-General notes, there have been contacts between the Secretariat and several countries of the region with a view to reactivating the activities of the Centre. It therefore seems to us inappropriate to adopt the Secretary-General's proposal to abolish the post of Director.

We reserve our right to give document A/52/309/Add.1 more careful study and to make further comments at a later stage.

The Chairman: I call on the Director of the Centre for Disarmament Affairs.

Mr. Davinic (Director of the Centre for Disarmament Affairs): A number of questions pertaining to the work of the regional centres have been raised. I must fully agree with the statement of the representative of Togo that the First Committee did not have on its agenda an item dealing with two of the three centres: those located in Lomé and in Lima. The one that was on the agenda for this year was the Kathmandu Centre, on which the Committee expressed itself in a draft resolution adopted by consensus last week.

We are actually dealing with several different issues here. The Secretary-General is pursuing two parallel activities. One is pursuant to the request of the First Committee, expressed at previous sessions, to do his utmost to revive the work of these centres by encouraging Member States interested in their work to make voluntary contributions for the activities of the centres and by finding alternative means for financing the work of the centres.

The other is as administrator of the Organization, in which capacity he has to act in a manner that is responsible in terms of the resources that are available to him. In that connection, he has, in the context of the proposed budget for the next biennium, brought to the attention of the Fifth Committee the problems that we have with financing the activities of the centres.

It was in fact a decision of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ) to request the Secretary-General to submit this report to the First Committee at this session. We had some difficulty finding an appropriate item under which to submit the report. The request came about a week ago — rather late — and the Budget Office, which actually compiled the report, did its utmost to provide the report before the end of the First Committee session.

As I said, upon closer examination of the content of this report, delegations will see that the Secretary-General is drawing attention to both positive and negative aspects of the flow of voluntary contributions. As I indicated, the matter is not completely closed; it is still being discussed in the Fifth Committee. I believe that the way to proceed is for delegations in this Committee to advise their colleagues in the Fifth Committee to take appropriate positions.

But the facts in this report are undeniable. It took the Budget Office quite some time to collect them and to present a very accurate and very clear-cut picture in terms of the inflow of voluntary contributions. We would have preferred to have had more time to prepare the report and to have been able to submit it to the Committee sooner. But the mechanics of the budget are such that it was necessary to submit the report at this session and to proceed as requested by the ACABQ.

I hope that this clarifies some of the concerns raised by members of the Committee.

Mr. Al-Hassan (Oman): The comments of my delegation will be confined to the question of transparency, in relation to draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1.

Oman supports transparency in all forms relating to armament and military development. We support all the draft resolutions introduced on this subject in this Committee, as we have done in the past, and we will continue to do so. We believe that it is one of the most important elements in strengthening confidence among States.

My delegation would be remiss if it did not state its position with regard to draft resolutions A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1 and A/C.1/52/L.43 and the Register of Conventional Arms. My delegation's position is quite consistent with that expressed by the Arab Group regarding

the inherent deficiencies that exist in the Register, particularly on the need for it to be more comprehensive and to include information on weapons of mass destruction as well as on conventional arms.

Given the calamities in the region, my delegation thinks that expanding the Register will be an important step that will serve the immediate security needs of many States in the region. I hope that in the future the thrust of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1 will find its way into the draft resolution on transparency, now contained in document A/C.1/52/L.43.

The Chairman: I will now give the floor to those members of the Committee wishing to explain their positions or votes before a decision is taken on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1.

Separate votes have been requested on the sixth preambular paragraph and on operative paragraph 3.

Mr. De Icaza (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mexico participates in the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms. However, from its inception we have maintained the need to expand it to include weapons of mass destruction so as to bolster its effectiveness as a means of building confidence through transparency.

We have some doubts about the scope of the terms used in operative paragraphs 2 and 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1, but we support its overall sense of balance. We trust that in the coming year consultations will make it possible to refine the concepts being outlined here and that ultimately we shall be able to prepare a single resolution on the subject that will command general support.

My delegation will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1 and all the paragraphs contained therein.

Mr. Grey (United States of America): The United States places the highest emphasis on the concept of transparency in armaments and was proud to co-sponsor draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.43, entitled "Transparency in armaments".

This draft resolution endorses the consensus report of the Group of Governmental Experts, including its recommendations. Not all of the objectives of individual participants in the Group met with consensus. For example, the United States was disappointed that the Group failed to recommend the expansion of the Register to report data on military holdings and procurement through national production on the same basis as imports and exports. Nevertheless, draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.43 tries to reflect the consensus of the Group and aims at maximizing support for the Register.

Unfortunately, I cannot say the same for draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2, Egypt's draft resolution entitled "Transparency in armaments". This draft resolution focuses on transparency related to weapons of mass destruction and goes well beyond the Group's consensus on this difficult issue. I would recall that the Group failed to reach consensus on including possible new types and categories in the Register. This failure also applies to Egypt's proposal for a new category on stocks of weapons of mass destruction. Earlier, Egypt joined the consensus of the Group, including its observations on the issue of transparency as related to weapons of mass destruction. It is unfortunate that Egypt has now decided to try to walk back that consensus.

Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2 directly links the concepts of transparency and conventional arms to transparency and weapons of mass destruction. No widespread agreement exists on how transparency could apply to weapons of mass destruction. Accordingly, linking it to transparency in conventional weapons, and to the Register, is a recipe for inaction and failure. We hope that is not its intention. The existence of weapons of mass destruction anywhere in the world could be used by any Member State as an excuse not to participate in the Register. We will never be able to build confidence if we allow such a transparent loophole to justify non-participation.

Moreover, draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2 is unnecessary since draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.43 already contains a provision to address the Egyptian concerns. Operative paragraph 7 invites the Conference on Disarmament to consider continuing its work on transparency in armaments. It is high time to re-establish the Ad Hoc Committee on this subject so that the concerns of States related to transparency can be discussed in a more substantive manner than in a debate on a draft resolution here in the First Committee.

For these reasons, my country opposes draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2 and urges others to do so as well.

Mr. Millim (Luxembourg) (*interpretation from French*): I have the honour to take the floor on behalf of

the European Union on the subject of transparency in the area of armaments, and in particular on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/52/L.2. The countries of Eastern and Central Europe associated with the European Union — Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia — associate themselves with this explanation of vote. Iceland and Norway, member countries of the European Economic Space, also align themselves with this statement.

The European Union took note with great satisfaction of the fact that the Group of Governmental Experts on the Register of Conventional Arms were able to achieve consensus in their report last August. Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.43, presented by the Netherlands, reflects that consensus, and its main purpose is to make the recommendations of the group of experts operational.

This is why the European Union has regretted that Egypt, which took part in the Group's consensus, submitted its own draft, which focuses on transparency in the context of weapons of mass destruction in a way which goes far beyond the Group's consensus on this sensitive and controversial issue.

Over the last four weeks, consultations and intensive negotiations have taken place with the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.43 and the delegation of the sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2, so as to take into account in the Netherlands draft the concerns expressed by the sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2.

As far as the European Union is concerned, those consultations were always based on the premise that the sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1 would withdraw the draft and support draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.43 if its concerns were taken into consideration.

In the course of those consultations, language was found that took account of the specific concerns of the primary sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1. While that language caused considerable difficulties for some of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.43, they were nonetheless ready to accept it in order to secure the support of the sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1.

The European Union was therefore surprised to learn that the sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1, while agreeing to withdraw that draft resolution, could still not support draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.43 even if it included the agreed amendments. This led to an unacceptable situation in which the specific concerns of one Member State would be reflected in a draft resolution that would then not be supported by that very same Member State.

At that point, of course, there was no real chance of achieving a credible compromise. The European Union opposes draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1 not only because of the procedure followed, but also because after the Group's consensus in 1997, one Member State represented in the Group is now seeking to break that consensus. At the same time, draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1 is not acceptable to the European Union for very important reasons of principle, for the draft resolution establishes a one-to-one relationship between the concept of transparency in conventional arms and that of transparency with regard to weapons of mass destruction. The Union is well aware that positions on the latter subject vary considerably. However, whatever the views with regard to ways of applying transparency to weapons of mass destruction, transparency cannot be linked either to transparency in the area of conventional arms or to the Register.

The success achieved in Europe and elsewhere in the sphere of confidence-building measures with regard to conventional arms would not have been possible had weapons of mass destruction been included in the equation. Nor would the Register have been strengthened had that notion been accepted, because Member States could use the very existence of weapons of mass destruction as a pretext for non-participation in the Register, thus undermining its validity.

In this light, the States members of the European Union and those States associating themselves with this explanation of vote once again appeal urgently to the primary sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1 to withdraw that draft resolution. Should that draft resolution be put to the vote, those States will vote against it as a bloc.

Ms. Laker (Canada): As is widely known in the First Committee, Canada is a firm advocate of the contribution that greater transparency can make in the fields of arms control, non-proliferation and disarmament. However, we are concerned by some of the terminology employed in draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1 and have uncertainties regarding its specific meaning. Thus, while reaffirming our commitment to transparency as a positive and vital element

of our work, Canada will vote "no" on this draft resolution.

Ms. Martinic (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Argentina fully agrees with the conclusion reached by the Group of Governmental Experts on the continuing operation and further development of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms to the effect that although the Register relates to conventional arms, the principle of transparency can also be applied, jointly with other measures, to weapons of mass destruction and the transfer of high technology with military applicability. This is recognized in paragraph 5 (a) of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.43, which the Committee adopted on Friday, 14 November. We do not therefore feel that another resolution need be adopted on the same subject.

Furthermore, my delegation believes that the development of transparency mechanisms in the sphere of weapons of mass destruction should not have the effect of weakening the effectiveness and efficiency of the existing mechanisms designed to create transparency in the area of conventional arms, such as the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms.

For this reason, and because we believe that any progress in this area should command consensus if it is to be successful, my delegation does not agree with the drafting of paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1. For those reasons, my delegation will abstain in the voting on the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. Goosen (South Africa): It is South Africa's intention to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1, on the basis of a clear policy on the part of our Government in favour of greater transparency in armaments. That policy applies to all armaments, whether conventional arms or weapons of mass destruction.

In the case of operative paragraph 3, on which, however, we will abstain, my Government has been a strong supporter of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms, and we do not believe that a linkage should be established between this draft resolution, A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1 and draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.43.

Mr. Bakiet (Sudan) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My delegation believes that transparency in armaments contributes greatly to building confidence between States and to the achievement of peace. In that context, my delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.43. In explaining our vote on that draft resolution, we indicated that transparency should be extended to weapons of mass destruction and to the transfers of equipment and technologies related to the development and manufacture of such weapons to strengthen peace and confidence among States throughout the world, to eliminate all weapons without selectivity and to ensure the transparency to which we all aspire. In view of these considerations, Sudan will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1 and wishes to be added to the list of sponsors of the draft resolution.

Ms. Hamilton (Australia): I am speaking to explain Australia's intention to vote against draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1. Australia supports as a general proposition the application of transparency and other confidence-building measures in the field of weapons of mass destruction. However, in our view, by implying that transparency in the field of conventional weapons is conditional on enhancing transparency in the field of weapons of mass destruction, draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1 reaches too far, and, as is now clear, the linkage is a divisive one.

We also regret that the sustained efforts by the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.43 to reach a compromise have failed and that two draft resolutions on the subject of transparency in armaments have gone forward for the Committee's consideration.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1.

A recorded vote has been requested. Separate, recorded votes have been requested on preambular paragraph 6 and operative paragraph 3.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1, entitled "Transparency in armaments", was introduced by the representative of Egypt at the 24th meeting of the Committee, on 17 November 1997. In addition to the sponsors listed in the draft resolution and those appearing in document A/C.1/52/INF/2, it was also sponsored by the Niger and the Sudan.

The Committee is now voting on the sixth preambular paragraph, which reads as follows:

"*Stressing* the need to achieve universality of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the Chemical Weapons Convention and the Biological Weapons Convention as well as other instruments related to transfers of equipment and technologies directly related to the development and manufacture of such weapons, with a view to realizing the goal of the total elimination of all weapons of mass destruction".

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Andorra, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Pakistan, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Canada, Chile, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Georgia, Ireland, Japan, Kazakhstan, Liechtenstein, Malta, Marshall Islands, Norway, Republic of Korea, San Marino, Senegal, Sweden, Turkey, Uzbekistan

The sixth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1 was retained by 80 votes to 34, with 25 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Sri Lanka informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman: I call on the Secretary of the Committee to continue the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee is now voting on operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guyana, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uzbekistan

Abstaining:

Argentina, Belarus, Chile, Cyprus, Georgia, India, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mongolia, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Senegal, Solomon Islands, South Africa

Operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1 was adopted by 73 votes to 46, with 17 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Sri Lanka informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman: I call on the Secretary of the Committee to continue the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now vote on A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uzbekistan

Abstaining:

Argentina, Belarus, Chile, China, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Georgia, India, Japan, Kazakhstan, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mongolia, Pakistan, Republic of Korea

Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1, as a whole, was adopted by 81 votes to 45, with 16 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Sri Lanka informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman: I shall now call on those representatives wishing to explain their votes or positions.

Mr. Fu Zhigang (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): China supports the application of appropriate and workable measures for transparency in armaments.

China has participated annually in the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms and has always supported a total ban on, and complete destruction of, all weapons of mass destruction.

Furthermore, we believe that in order to achieve these objectives, the ultimate application of the principle of transparency to weapons of mass destruction is necessary and inevitable.

The international community has now concluded the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) and the Biological Weapons Convention (BWC), and negotiations on a BWC protocol are proceeding smoothly. Problems related to transparency and verification with regard to these two categories of weapons of mass destruction have been resolved or are being addressed.

With regard to the other category of existing weapons of mass destruction — nuclear weapons — it is our view that the immediate priority should be to proceed from our current reality and that efforts should be made to promote the process of nuclear disarmament and to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

In this connection, the countries with the largest and most advanced nuclear arsenals should continue to take the

lead in reducing drastically those arsenals and in renouncing their double or multiple standards regarding the proliferation of nuclear weapons in order to create conditions for ultimate full transparency and the total destruction of nuclear weapons.

For these reasons, the Chinese delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1, entitled "Transparency in armaments", and we did not participate in the voting on the sixth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 3.

Mr. Benítez Verson (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1 because it reflects useful elements for a broader approach to the question of transparency than has prevailed thus far.

Weapons of mass destruction cannot be excluded from the efforts of the international community in the area of transparency. To apply the principle of transparency to conventional weapons alone or to attempt to view transparency in conventional weapons as distinct from that in weapons of mass destruction would be to take a discriminatory and selective approach that we do not endorse.

We hope that the Committee will be able next year to adopt a single resolution on this issue that takes duly into account the need for transparency to be integral in all its aspects. In the meantime, I wish to place it clearly on record that my delegation's vote in favour of the draft resolution can in no way be interpreted as representing a change in our position vis-à-vis the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. That is why my delegation abstained in the separate voting on the sixth preambular paragraph.

Mr. Grey (United States of America): My delegation voted against retaining the sixth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1. While we support the treaties mentioned and their universality, this paragraph distorts their purposes and goals.

Mr. Manickam (India): My delegation called for a separate vote on and voted against the sixth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1 — which stresses, *inter alia*, the need to achieve universality of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) — and abstained in the voting on the draft resolution as a whole. The reasons for this are obvious and consistent with India's stand on the NPT. India is not a party to the NPT and has no intention of becoming one.

Mr. Berdennikov (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): I wish to note for the record that our vote against the sixth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1 should not be interpreted as indicating that we have any problem with the appeal to achieve universality of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the Chemical Weapons Convention or the Biological Weapons Convention. We have consistently asserted that these very important international disarmament instruments should be universal and that all countries that have not yet done so should accede to them as soon as possible.

Our negative vote on the paragraph reflects the fact that the text is so drafted as to distort the purposes, content and basic orientation of these treaties. That is why we were compelled to press the red button.

Mr. Dehghani (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.2/Rev.1, entitled "Transparency in armaments", because we attach great importance to transparency in weapons of mass destruction, in all its aspects.

However, we are of the view that, in accordance with the content of resolution 46/36 L, adopted by the General Assembly in 1991, the principle of transparency in armaments applies to conventional weapons, high technology with military applications and weapons of mass destruction in all their aspects. As stated by the representative of Egypt, a sponsor of the draft resolution, our vote on this draft resolution should in no way be interpreted to indicate that we have changed our position on the necessity of transparency in high technology with military applications.

The Chairman: The Committee will proceed to consider draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.28/Rev.1. Separate votes have been requested on the ninth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1.

I shall now give the floor to those members of the Committee wishing to explain their votes before the voting.

Mr. Manickam (India): My delegation has called for a recorded vote on the ninth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/52/L.28/Rev.1.

Though it is entitled "Nuclear disarmament with a view to the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons", it would perhaps have been more correctly entitled "Implementation of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT)", since the draft resolution appears to seek, as we pointed out last year, to introduce into a General Assembly resolution language adopted by the States parties to the Treaty. In previous years, when this draft resolution has been presented, we have voiced our objection to this intention. Since it has been repeated this year, we will have to maintain our position on the draft resolution even though we support the elimination of nuclear weapons, regardless of the forum in which it is negotiated.

We do not happen to believe — and the experience of the international community to date supports this view — that the NPT route will in fact lead to the elimination of nuclear weapons. On the contrary, the indefinite extension of the Treaty appears to have only further served the interests of those States that do not want to move towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons. We therefore cannot agree with the draft resolution, which seeks to translate the inequality of the NPT into customary law and which welcomes the indefinite extension of such a Treaty.

We have also called for a separate vote on the ninth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1. The ninth preambular paragraph welcomes the adoption of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT). Our position on the adoption of this Treaty is known. The reasons for our position are still valid and do not need repetition. Our reasons for opposing operative paragraph 1 are evident. India has not signed the NPT and has no intention of doing so.

Mr. Benítez Verson (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): This year, my delegation will once again abstain in the voting on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/52/L.28/Rev.1, because we believe that it does not establish a minimum basis for universal acceptance in the area of nuclear disarmament.

As we have indicated ever since this draft resolution began circulating in the Committee, it focuses, despite its title, on questions of non-proliferation and stresses a treaty that is essentially selective and discriminatory — the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons — and to which my country is not a State party. In my delegation's view, it does not help to create as speedily as possible the requisite conditions for moving towards the objective of nuclear disarmament.

We shall therefore abstain in the voting on operative paragraph 1 and on the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. De Icaza (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation will be voting in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.28/Rev.1. Had the amendments contained in L.48 been put to the vote, we would also have voted in favour of those amendments.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/52/L.28/Rev.1.

Separate votes have been requested on the ninth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1. I now call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the First Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.28/Rev.1, entitled "Nuclear disarmament with a view to the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons" was introduced by the representative of Japan at the 16th meeting, on 16 November 1997. In addition to those countries listed in the draft resolution and in document A/C.1/52/INF/2, it was also co-sponsored by the following countries: Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Hungary, Iceland, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Niger, Portugal, Romania and South Africa.

The Committee will now vote on the ninth preambular paragraph, which reads as follows:

> "Welcoming the adoption of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty at the fiftieth session of the General Assembly and its opening for signature at the beginning of the fifty-first session, and noting the subsequent signing of that Treaty by over 140 Member States".

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador,

Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India

Abstaining:

Bhutan, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Syrian Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania

The ninth preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.28/Rev.1 was retained by 141 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

The Chairman: I now call on the Committee Secretary to continue the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the First Committee): The Committee will now vote on operative paragraph 1.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India, Israel, Pakistan

Abstaining:

Cuba

Operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.28/Rev.1 was retained by 142 votes to 3, with 1 abstention.

The Chairman: I again call on the Committee Secretary to continue the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the First Committee): The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.28/Rev.1 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Algeria, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Myanmar, Nigeria, Pakistan

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 138 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.

The Chairman: I will now call on those delegations who wish to explain their position or vote after the decision.

Mr. Fu Zhigang (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): With regard to draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.28/Rev.1, entitled "Nuclear disarmament with a view to the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons" and sponsored by Japan, China voted in favour of both the ninth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1 and, for the first time, also voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole.

China has always stood for a total prohibition and complete destruction of nuclear weapons. Therefore we have no objection to the thrust and objective of this resolution, which is that nuclear weapons should ultimately be eliminated and, until then, their proliferation should be prevented.

We have noted that this year's draft is an improvement over those of the past two years. It is comprehensive and balanced, and this has created the conditions for our switch to a favourable vote on the resolution.

In recent years, some non-aligned countries have also sponsored resolutions on nuclear disarmament which have enjoyed the support of most of the countries. As both the draft by the Non-Aligned Movement and resolution L.28/Rev.1 are aimed at the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons, we once suggested and continue to hope that the sponsors of these two resolutions can enter into friendly consultations with a view to combining these two resolutions. We believe this could be a specific step to facilitate the rationalization of the work of the First Committee and to improve its efficiency.

Mr. Chowdhury (Bangladesh): Bangladesh voted yes on resolution A/C.1/52/L.28/Rev.1 and on the ninth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1, because my delegation considers it a step towards the attainment of general and complete nuclear disarmament, which in our opinion should be the global community's primary concern, and in the pursuit of which we shall make every effort.

In no way does our support for this resolution and for the ninth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 1 prejudice our basic position and our priorities as just enunciated. We would have liked to see a much stronger thrust in the direction of total nuclear disarmament than the language currently contains.

However, I must also add that we favour, as we always have and shall, all measures towards non-proliferation as well, which is what led us to join the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT)

and the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT). It is this consistency that our positive votes reflect.

Mr. Dehghani (Islamic Republic of Iran): The views of my delegation on the issue of nuclear disarmament are basically reflected in the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/52/L.29, which was adopted by the First Committee last week.

My delegation also supports the basic thrust of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/52/L.28/Rev.1, sponsored by the Japanese delegation. However, we abstained in the voting on this draft resolution because its substance is not consistent with its title. The draft resolution purports to be a nuclear-disarmament initiative, but its elements focus solely on non-proliferation issues. Accordingly, my delegation believes that the draft resolution in its present form still needs some improvements if it is to be relevant to its title.

As regards the seventh preambular paragraph, while we welcome the decision on strengthening the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons review process and the decision on principles and objectives, we believe it is too early to welcome the decision to extend the Treaty indefinitely, since we are still waiting to see how the various decisions and resolutions adopted at the Review and Extension Conference will be implemented and whether commitments agreed upon after intensive negotiations will indeed be fulfilled in good faith.

Mr. Mesdoua (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): For the following reasons my delegation was unable to vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/52/L.28/Rev.1, which was just put to the vote.

First, in our view, the text duplicates and, indeed, in some respects conflicts with draft resolution, A/C.1/52/L.29, which, as in the case of similar draft resolutions in the past, Algeria supported by co-sponsoring. Secondly, the title given to the draft does not seem to us to reflect exactly the content of the document. Thirdly, some of the elements included are not in accord with our views on nuclear disarmament. These views are in complete harmony with the position appropriately reaffirmed by the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) at the Cartagena Summit, at the New Delhi Conference in April 1997 and at its meeting in New York on 25 September, in the context of the fifty-second session of the General Assembly, through its promotion of concrete steps to eliminate nuclear weapons. Fourthly, the conceptual approach of this draft resolution — that is, non-proliferation — does not include specific measures for, or give priority to, achieving the total and definitive elimination of nuclear weapons within a specified time-frame.

Lastly, if the amendments submitted by Pakistan in document A/C.1/52/L.48 had been put to the vote, my delegation would have voted in favour of those amendments.

For all of these reasons, my delegation was unable to vote in favour of this draft resolution, and we once again appeal to its authors to strive during the next session to take into account the concerns of a large number of countries, including my own.

Mrs. Laose-Ajayi (Nigeria): The views of the Nigerian delegation on this item have been very well reflected in the draft resolution we adopted, contained in document A/C.1/52/L.29. We feel it has addressed all the pertinent concerns.

The Nigerian delegation was unable to vote in favour of the present draft resolution because we believe it has not addressed the issues substantively enough. It is our hope that next year we will be able to merge the two draft resolutions, so that we can have one draft on this very important issue.

The Chairman: If no other delegations wish to take the floor at this stage, the Committee will now proceed to consider the draft decision contained in document A/C.1/52/L.51/Rev.1.

I had tabled the draft decision contained in document A/C.1/52/L.51/Rev.1 on the understanding that it would command consensus. I now understand that amendments to the draft decision are being proposed. Since I have no intention of holding another meeting of the Committee tomorrow, I have decided to withdraw the draft decision for further consultations by the Chairman. The Chairman or his successor will report the results of these consultations to the Committee at its next session.

Concluding statement by the Chairman

We have concluded the last phase of the Committee's work: action on all draft resolutions and decisions under agenda items 62 to 83. As we approach the end of our work, I would like to share with members some reflections on the work of the First Committee as we come to the conclusion of the fifty-second session.

At the outset, let me commend all delegations for the cooperative atmosphere that has permeated our deliberations in the past few weeks. There was an overall mood of mutual respect, even where national positions might have suggested differently. That mood definitely enhanced the image of the United Nations as an institution devoted to dialogue, even on matters related to sovereign interests and national security. This reinforced the sense that the Governments represented here are engaged in a collaborative joint effort aimed at confidence-building and, therefore, fostering disarmament. I wish to express my appreciation to all delegations for contributing to this positive atmosphere.

At this juncture, let me highlight some issues that appear to have been notable in the deliberations of the First Committee during this session.

It is noteworthy that efforts have indisputably been made in scaling down nuclear weapons at both the unilateral and bilateral levels. It is equally indisputable that the world expects the process to continue at a steady and more rapid pace and that this should be done at the multilateral level.

It is my ardent hope that a solution will soon be found on those issues which divide us, and I especially hope that some progress will be made in the framework of the Conference on Disarmament at its session next year.

On a different note, I must say I am encouraged by the progress being made in the area of nuclear non-proliferation at the regional level, particularly with respect to the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. The existing nuclear-weapon-free zones are being strengthened. The Committee has requested the Disarmament Commission to continue its work on setting out guidelines for the establishment of such zones. The five zonal States of Central Asia understand the complexities involved in establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in their region, and they have requested the assistance of the international community in the realization of such a zone. They are determined to achieve their objective, and they need the cooperation and understanding of their neighbours, some of which are nuclear-weapon States. I am pleased that the First Committee has given them encouragement in their endeavour.

The First Committee has also had two first-time events this session in the area of weapons of mass destruction. We heard an outstanding statement by the newly appointed Director-General of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons, which was established in The Hague in April this year. The Committee welcomed the entry into force of the Chemical Weapons Convention and the inauguration of the Organization. We were informed of the recent ratification of the Convention by several important States, particularly the declared chemical-weapon States. Those ratifications have increased confidence in the Convention and the chemical disarmament regime and bode well for the future universalization of the agreement.

We also heard, for the first time, a report by the Executive Secretary of the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization, who was appointed last March and started the substantive work of the Provisional Technical Secretariat without delay.

These two events are significant for two reasons. They highlight the important links between the First Committee of the General Assembly and those organizations; and they also point the way to further collaboration in consolidating and strengthening existing disarmament and arms-limitation agreements.

Regarding conventional weapons, the Committee heard an impassioned exchange of views on the issue of anti-personnel mines. Of all the items we have dealt with this session, this was the one issue which received the greatest scrutiny from international public opinion; expectations had grown sharply for the United Nations disarmament machinery to play its part in this worldwide effort.

In my view, our deliberations confirmed once again that all States share the basic humanitarian objective of eliminating anti-personnel mines, which maim and kill indiscriminately even in post-conflict situations. The final objective of the universalization of this new norm in international disarmament law seems to be accepted and underlined. Nonetheless, it was also clear that not all States are ready to accept at this time a total ban on those weapons or to sign the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction.

I am most grateful to all members that the debate on this issue did not degenerate into what could have become a war between "humanitarian virtucrats" and "mine mongers". However, views continue to differ on the mechanism to be employed to eliminate the menace presented by mines. Some prefer the universalization of the Ottawa process and some the strict compliance with and greater adherence to Amended Protocol II of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCWC) and

its review process, while others prefer the framework of the Conference on Disarmament. In the interests of the numerous victims of these weapons, I should like to seize this opportunity to express the hope that States will continue to promote the achievement of the final goal of eliminating these mines altogether through ways and means acceptable to all parties concerned.

As to other conventional weapons, there is broad agreement in the First Committee that the international community should continue to tackle the widespread problem of the illegal and illicit proliferation of small arms. The General Assembly had before it the report on small arms, an unprecedented effort at the international level to grasp the scope of the issue and to make recommendations on what contribution it could make to its resolution. Coming from a part of the world that has experienced some of the worst consequences of these flows of weapons, I welcome the fact that the Committee will continue to be seized of the matter. The two studies foreseen in draft resolution A/C.1/52/L.27/Rev.1 — a study of the problems of ammunition and explosives and a report on the implementation of the recommendations of the report on small arms — should shed greater light on how the United Nations should tackle this issue.

The First Committee has once again recognized the important contribution that transparency and openness in armaments can make to confidence-building and trust among States, thereby fostering the adoption of mutually agreed disarmament measures. It has welcomed the report of the Group of Governmental Experts that reviewed the continuing operation and further development of the Register of Conventional Arms and called for fuller participation and greater openness by all States. Notwithstanding the continued divergence of views on how to expand the scope of the Register as a transparency measure, I should like to stress that the Register is already proving its viability as a confidence-building measure that contributes in no small measure to international security.

Finally, it is noteworthy that the Committee has this year been able to adopt without a vote the resolution on convening the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. I welcome this meeting of the minds in the Committee and hope the Disarmament Commission will yield positive results in its consideration of this issue next year.

The Committee's meetings this year have been held during the session at which the General Assembly is considering the Secretary-General's proposals for renewing the United Nations. The General Assembly has just approved the proposal of the Secretary-General to reinstate the Department for Disarmament Affairs. Let me, on behalf of all members of the Committee, welcome that decision. It is my view that the reinstatement of the Department for Disarmament Affairs constitutes a clear signal to all nations that the Assembly recognizes the contribution that the determined pursuit of effective and verifiable disarmament can make to reinforcing a culture of cooperation in the field of international peace and security.

The First Committee has once again taken up the issue of the rationalization of its work and reform of its agenda. The Committee demonstrated flexibility in reviewing its procedures and discarded those which seemed no longer to work. Here I must express regret that we were not able to adopt the decision that we had hoped to adopt at the end of our work today.

On a personal note, as Chairman of the Committee, I should like to thank all members of the Committee most sincerely for the cooperation they have extended to me during this session. It was indeed a singular honour and privilege for me to have worked with people so distinguished and knowledgeable in the field of disarmament. Members have reinvigorated and sharpened my tools of analysis in the area, and I wish to thank them for the free education. It is most heartening to preside over a Committee in which one feels one is among friends.

I also wish to express my sincere thanks and gratitude to the two Vice-Chairmen, Mr. Sudjadnan Parnohadiningrat and Mr. Alejandro Verdier, and to the Rapporteur, Mr. Miloš Koterec, for their assistance and camaraderie.

Let me, on behalf of the Committee, thank the Director of the Centre for Disarmament Affairs, Mr. Prvoslav Davinic, as well as the Secretary of the Committee, Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung and all his collaborators in the Secretariat, for their professionalism and efficiency, without which the work of the Committee could not have run so smoothly.

Last, but by no means least, I wish to extend a special word of thanks to our interpreters, translators, record keepers, press officers, conference and documents officers, sound engineers and all those who worked behind the scenes to make the work of the Committee run smoothly.

I call on the representative of Colombia.

Mr. García (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I just wanted to express briefly, on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, our gratitude to you, Mr. Chairman, and our congratulations on the exemplary fashion in which you have guided our deliberations, which has enabled the work of the First Committee to show positive results. The countries of the Non-Aligned Movement also wish to thank the other members of the Bureau for their work.

I would also like to express our gratitude to the Director of the Centre for Disarmament Affairs, the members of the Secretariat, the conference officers and the interpreters for their impeccable work in support of the work of the Committee.

The Chairman: I now give the floor to the representative of Luxembourg.

Mr. Millim (Luxembourg) (*interpretation from French*): On behalf of the European Union and associated states and members of the European Economic Area, which align themselves with this statement, I would like to convey to you, Mr. Chairman, my sincere congratulations.

Throughout our meetings, the European Union has endeavoured to give you its fullest possible support as you fulfilled your lofty responsibilities. Generally speaking, this session was not one of the most difficult, even though we had to take certain difficult decisions by voting on them.

On behalf of the European Union, I would like to offer you our sincere thanks for the excellent job you have done and for those times when you lent us your support. I personally appreciated greatly your sense of humour and the discipline that you were able to impose on members, which enabled us to begin and end our daily work on time and allowed us to begin each day fresh and full of energy.

Of course, we also wish to thank the other members of the Bureau and all those who supported you so effectively in carrying out your responsibilities, particularly the Secretary of the Committee, whose long experience has worked wonders once again this year. Our deep appreciation also goes to the interpreters and the persons responsible for producing and distributing documents. Without their effective and ubiquitous support for delegations, we would not have been able to complete our session. Therefore, thank them all very much.

Finally, I would like to say how much we have appreciated working with all our colleagues present here in the room, in particular with those with whom we have been engaged in direct negotiations throughout our meetings. We thank them. The European Union intends to continue these discussions next year in the same spirit of mutual cooperation.

The Chairman: I give the floor to the representative of Kenya.

Ms. Tolle (Kenya): The Group of African States fully associates itself with the statement just made by the representative of Colombia on behalf of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, to which we belong; and on behalf of the Group of African States, I wish to express our appreciation to you, Mr. Chairman, and our congratulations on the successful manner in which you have conducted the work of the First Committee this year. Your pragmatic approach and diplomatic skills and experience have enabled this Committee to conclude its work well ahead of schedule. Your personal qualities and pleasant sense of humour have been refreshing, and, on a personal note, I congratulate you on being such a good student.

Our thanks also go to the two Vice-Chairmen and the Rapporteur for the supportive role they have played. Our gratitude is also extended to Mr. Davinic, Director of the Centre for Disarmament Affairs, and Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung, Secretary of the Committee, for the assistance they have extended to us all. I would be remiss if I failed to recognize the presence of Mr. Petrovsky and Mr. Bensmail, Secretary-General and Deputy Secretary-General of the Geneva-based Conference on Disarmament, respectively, whose wide experience in the subject matter, as in previous years, has enhanced our work. We also wish to thank all conference officers, interpreters, translators and all the others who contributed to our work.

In the last seven weeks, we have greatly appreciated the spirit of cooperation, consultation and compromise demonstrated by all delegations. Friendships have been built and partnerships found. In this respect, we convey our appreciation to the various regional coordinators, as well as individual delegations and delegates, for being accommodating and understanding.

As this session advances, the prospects for the new year and the forthcoming holiday season draw near. I wish, on behalf of the Group of African States, to convey to each and every member of the Committee our warm seasonal greetings and best wishes for 1998, and to those who are travelling back to their respective duty stations, I wish to say *bon voyage*.

The Chairman: I now give the floor to the representative of Uzbekistan.

Mr. Vohidov (Uzbekistan): In my capacity as Chairman of the Group of Asian States for the month of November, I should like, on behalf of the delegations of the Asian States, to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your excellent leadership, which has helped us bring the deliberations and work of the First Committee to a successful and early conclusion. Your wide knowledge and diplomatic experience played a very important role in helping us to reach this result.

I should also like to extend our gratitude to the Bureau and all members of the Secretariat for their contribution to the work of the Committee, as well as to the Director of the Centre for Disarmament Affairs, Mr. Davinic, and the Secretary of the Committee, Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung, for their very professional work and for the help they have extended to all of us. Many thanks also go to the interpreters, the conference officers and, indeed, to everyone who has facilitated the smooth work of the First Committee.

On behalf of the delegations of our Group, Mr. Chairman, I wish you all the best in your future undertakings.

The Chairman: I now give the floor to the representative of Belarus.

Mr. Laptsenak (Belarus) (*interpretation from Russian*): It is my honour and pleasure, on behalf of the Group of Eastern European States, to congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, and all the members of the Bureau, on the successful completion of the work of the First Committee.

The traditional abundance of draft resolutions and decisions adopted by the First Committee, their content and their thrust called for many consultations and agreements and a demonstration by sponsors and participants in debates, of a spirit of compromise and realism. In the final analysis, the basic trends characterizing the efforts of the international community in the area of the maintenance of international security and disarmament have been adequately reflected and further consolidated. On each issue addressed, the resolutions and decisions adopted demonstrate appropriate and real ways and means to make further progress towards general and complete disarmament. In many instances, they reflected those steps and important decisions that have already been implemented by Member States, both in the field of conventional armaments and in that of weapons of mass destruction. Some are already producing practical results in the near term, and the consequences of others will be seen only after some time. However, in both instances, the recurrent theme is the need for coordinated and systematic cooperation among all members of the international community, without which it will be impossible to resolve outstanding issues.

The persistence and tolerance that, on the whole, characterized the present session and the discussions of the First Committee is no doubt to the credit of the participants and of your leadership, Sir. Your diplomatic skills and mastery were a reliable indicator of the discussions of this session. We are doubly delighted to congratulate you on your highly professional approach to the stewardship of this Committee in taking the baton from the chairmanship of Belarus. We would also like to congratulate and thank all those who have supported us in our efforts.

With the discussions in the First Committee having reached their conclusion, the members of the Group of Eastern European States, together with our partners from other regions, are prepared to initiate joint work aimed at implementing the decisions taken.

The Chairman: I give the floor to the representative of Antigua and Barbuda.

Mr. Hunte (Antigua and Barbuda): In my capacity as Chairman of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States for the month of November and on behalf of the delegations of the Group, I wish, Sir, to express our gratitude for the way in which you guided the deliberations of the Committee to a successful and early conclusion. Through you, I should like also to express our gratitude to the Director of the Centre for Disarmament Affairs, Mr. Davinic; the Secretary, Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung; the Rapporteur; and the two Vice-Chairmen.

Let me not forget the Secretariat, whose arduous work helped to ensure the successful conclusion of the work of the Committee. May I also express thanks to the conference officers, the interpreters and all the administrative staff who have contributed to the successful conclusion of this session.

The Chairman: I give the floor to the representative of Jamaica.

Mr. McCook (Jamaica): I want to associate myself and our delegations — the delegations of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) States Members of the United Nations — with the statements of Colombia, on behalf of

the Non-Aligned Movement, and of the Chairman of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States, on behalf of the States of that Group. We want to join in thanking you, Sir, and the Bureau for the exemplary manner in which you have conducted the work of this Committee. Our thanks also go, through you, to Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung, Secretary of the Committee; Mr. Davinic, Director of the Centre for Disarmament Affairs; Cheryl Stoute, Secretary of the Disarmament Commission; and all the members of the Secretariat who have given full support to our efforts and have contributed in no small way to the success and early conclusion of our work.

The Chairman: I give the floor to the representative of Malta.

Ms. Darmanin (Malta): On behalf of the Group of Western European and other States, allow me to thank you, Sir, for the skilful and efficient manner in which you presided over the work of this Committee. Your patience, perseverance and, I might add, good humour served us well in the successful outcome of our work. Our thanks and appreciation also go to the Bureau of the Committee, the Director of the Centre for Disarmament Affairs and the Secretary of the Committee, as well as all the Secretariat, whose hard work also facilitated the smooth functioning of our work.

The meeting rose at 5.35 p.m.